

---

Hoosier Archives is a periodic listing of the Diplomacy library of Walter Buchanan, R. R. 3, Lebanon, Indiana 46052; Archives Director, NFFFGEDD; a Director of The Diplomacy Association; and a member of IFW. Additions to the library are solicited. Reprints of Diplomacy articles are published, although original contributions are solicited. Although the library is private, its use is for postal Diplomacy in general. Anyone desiring a copy at cost of any of the publications listed, which are unavailable at the source, should write to the above address. To subscribe to Hoosier Archives, send one stamped, self-addressed envelope per issue. Trades are also welcomed.

---

### ARCHIVES LISTING

As stated in Hoosier Archives #16, the archives listing, due to its present large size, will only appear infrequently or when substantial additions have been added to the archives.

---

### OUT OF THE ARCHIVES

"Out of the Archives" continues this issue with a reprint taken from International Wargamer, the official organ of the International Federation of Wargaming. "Treaties" is published with the permission of its author, Lenard W. Lakofka, the president of IFW. It appeared in the "Diplomacy Forum" of Volume III, 6 of the International Wargamer. The "Diplomacy Forum" is a regular feature of International Wargamer and is one very good reason for any Diplomacy fan to join the IFW. Tell them Walt sent you!

### TREATIES

by

Lenard W. Lakofka

The treaty is one of the most valuable tools available to the Diplomacy player. It carries with it both a game and a long term statement of your playing ability and trustworthiness. Let us examine the many aspects of the treaty in play.

To begin, we need to define what general types of arrangements are open to us. Treaty types usually are in three major categories; mutual aggression, mutual defense or neutrality-non-intervention. Each of these types is a "term" treaty, i.e. good for a specific number of game years or valid depending on certain predefined contingencies.

#### I. MUTUAL AGGRESSION TREATIES

Areas of discussion: 1) enemy(s), 2) spheres of influence, 3) duration, 4) neutral zones, 5) patterns of builds, 6) obligations of each ally, 7) terms for renegotiation, 8) terms of dissolution, 9) information to be given to your ally, 10) public announcements and 11) other areas of cooperation, i.e. neutrality or mutual defense.

An effective treaty should cover each of these areas in the depth you feel necessary to achieve your overall game goal.

1. The first general area of contact, prior to a formal treaty, is usually "who should we attack?" Thus your treaty will mention specifically that enemy(s) you plan to attack together. If you are making a "game duration" treaty, then the general order in which opponents will be attacked should be mentioned. Rarely should you ever take on more than one opponent at a time -- remember that. A treaty launching attacks on two or more fronts is very dangerous, through 1904 or so.

2. Once your enemy is defined you want to REALISTICALLY define zones of

influence. The other five players are not just going to vaporize because you have a treaty! It is wise to define immediate and ultimate goals, however, with a timetable of subjugation. Areas should define, not only supply centers, but key provinces between them also.

3. Treaty duration is THE most important facet of the document! Timing of a treaty is the hardest single area to come up with. You want to allow enough time to secure areas as per part 2 of the treaty, but not so long as to encumber you for a remaining portion of the game. Thus it is VERY wise to contact all six players and get some idea of their intentions prior to signing any treaty! I.e. If England and Germany plan to attack France they must have some reasonable idea of the position of both Russia and Italy. If both pledge non-intervention, a four year agreement should do. If Russia is belligerent, five years would be better; if Italy is allied with France, Iberia will be a tough nut to crack, figure on six years, etc. If you time a treaty well, it will lapse just in time for you to negotiate with other players just prior to termination.

4. Neutral zones between your two countries are standard. Usually neutral zones in the spheres of influence you've defined are also given. It is highly advantageous to place specific time limits on neutrality zones, I.e. if Italy and France ally, Pied is neutral, however it might be necessary to move there to attack Tyr with support prior to 1903. Finally neutral zones should not be absolute; I.e. you can move there if you inform your ally of either a need or desire to go there.

5. Patterns of builds act as a security provision in the treaty. I.e. between Italy and France: France is asked not to build Fleets in Mar; between Germany and England, Germany is asked to build armies and England Fleets through 1907 or so; between Turkey and Russia, Russia is asked not to build fleets in Sev and Turkey not to build them in Ank, etc.

6. Obligations of each ally usually mean support commitments. I.e. if you are asked for support it must be given. The usual codicil is "unless that piece(s) is needed to maintain the integrity of spheres of influence already under our domain." Thus, if giving support would compromise centers you have already taken you may be released from the obligation to support.

This section can also discuss demilitarization of common fronts at specific times or under specific conditions. Thus, between Turkey and Russia; after 1905 or so, Rum, Bul and Ela are usually demilitarized totally.

7. Terms of renegotiation prescribe a time prior to treaty termination, when the treaty must be renegotiated. This provision will state that the current treaty is not to be violated if renegotiation cannot be agreed on. Also it states that each player is to give the other a one year warning prior to the onset of hostilities.

8. Terms of dissolution allow for termination prior to the deadline but only under predefined circumstances. I.e. as Italy you have a treaty with Austria vs. Turkey. If Austria attacks Germany prior to 1904 you may add the provision that part or all of this treaty is dissolved. Also if an ally misses a move(s) termination can result, etc. The standard clause being "this treaty shall terminate if either of the undersigned violates a provision of this treaty without written permission from the other signatory(s), but shall not terminate if either signatory performs an act not specifically outlawed in this document."

9. Information to be given encompasses two areas; moves, retreats and builds, and negotiation with other powers. It is standard to require your ally to tell you his planned move on, at least, your common front, each turn. He should inform you of his final move or course, a move which you should discuss prior to submission if possible. Deadlines of less than two weeks do not lend themselves to this, alas.

Second, it is requested that you inform your ally of all correspondence sent or received from current or potential enemies. Thus, you have some indication of what is going on elsewhere on the board.

10. Public announcements are the press releases and correspondence going to other players. I.e. "How sweet it is" to blast your ally in print and watch an opponent laugh -- as you take two home centers from him.

11. Other areas of cooperation involve neutrality vs other players or mutual defense agreements over and above current aggressive operations. I.e. England and Germany aggressively ally against France, have a mutual defense pact against Russia, and pledge neutrality if England attacks Italy or Germany attacks Austria.

## II. MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATIES

Areas of discussion: 1) duration, 2) vs. which players, 3) neutral zones, 4) build patterns and 5) obligations. Although some of the other aforementioned areas can also be discussed, they are not necessary.

1. Duration is usually for the entire game. If such and such a country attacks, then aid will be given.

2. Those players who are covered should be specific, never make it nebulous or you may find you yourself obliged to defend a country against which you have an aggressive treaty!!!

3. Neutral zones are a necessary safety factor to keep both players honest.

4. Building patterns are another safety factor.

5. This is the important one. 1) How much aid am I pledged to give? 2) Must the aid be in the form of aggressive moves vs the attacker or in support for the ally's pieces? 3) Under what condition(s) may I be removed from this obligation?

Quite often mutual defense may include a provision that if war between so and so and a signee occurs the other signee must come to his aid. However, that is an aggression treaty! Be careful that you do not get in a war you do not want!

Gross stupidity is a good excuse for breaking a treaty. You can provide for it in a few ways. If an ally starts a battle which causes another player to enter the fray against him you should make a provision to get out of the treaty, if you can.

## III. NEUTRALITY TREATIES

This treaty is used most often in the early game years and defines neutral areas and gives a time limit. There are no obligations except to not attack this guy for a few years. Thus each can go his separate ways and have one flank secure.

Now we have a treaty, let us see what can be done with it. Wording the document carefully is most important. The more you trust an ally the fewer loop holes you need to include. A number of the imperative ones I have already mentioned in the text above.

The treaty's value is two fold, in the current game as a safety factor, and in future games! In the current game the treaty allows for development and play. If an ally breaks the treaty you simply Xerox it and send it to the other players! His honesty will suddenly become very suspect! If he does so late in the game, you can hold future games over his head! A player who willy-nilly breaks ironclad provisions of a treaty will fare poorly in other games in which you find yourselves. (Also such a reputation "gets around" quickly.)

The real skill in the game involves making just the right treaties, for just the correct length of time each. There is no loss of face in attacking someone after a treaty has lapsed. The only problem occurs when you get snagged into a treaty with a real dolt -- then you just have to grin and bear it and hope he violates your treaty so that you can get out of the thing. No matter how poorly he bungles you have to have a sure way out, one that distinctly violates a treaty provision. Otherwise you will get the bad reputation, not him.

A player who breaks a treaty when he sees that he is doomed (a few players have attacked him) is still as guilty of bad ethics, if not more so, than one who breaks it when it's just for his own benefit. There is more honor in going down with the sinking ship than trying to take your ally with you, thus staying alive a few more seasons. It is both a wise and correct procedure, when you are being annihilated by others, to throw your remaining force against your opponents, and let your ally have as many of your centers as you can give him.

Of course you can get out of a treaty in a number of ways. Clever wording of key passages is usually the safest way. The idea is to put in a "destruction" passage which is very open to interpretation. However, if you get in this habit you are going to get creamed in the long run. The best way to play the game is honestly; half truths and ambiguous statements are proper for negotiation, but in poor taste within a treaty.

When you ask a player for a treaty and he gives you "the bum's rush" (ancient

Polish witty saying) i.e. stalls, have not second thoughts about attacking him! His is very likely setting you up. The worst ally is one who says "let's negotiate each move separately." Him you do not need.

A last word of warning is to not have too many treaties per game. They have a nasty habit of overlapping at some point and you will be caught between one ally and another. The ultimate goal is to build up your reputation as a good and worthy ally and opponent. If you play each game separately, with no thought of the future, you will do well in the beginning but win, place and show in few games after that!

-----

## INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF WARGAMING

The IFW was established in 1966 as the USCAC. In 1967 the name was changed to the INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF WARGAMING along with the club's major goals. It switched from a conquest game oriented club to a professional organization whose goal was to provide services and publications to the wargaming community. Over the years, it has moved forward toward this goal. It now prints a top quality photo-offset magazine, the INTERNATIONAL WARGAMER, and has sponsored and fostered numerous special interest groups (societies) through advertising, news, subsidy and providing the membership backbone off of which they could form. Its conventions have been numerous and its investment in the entire field of wargaming, not just within its own organization have been many. Its chief goal still is the improvement of wargaming, not the perpetuation of the IFW.

The Diplomacy Society of the IFW has over 20 affiliated magazines, all of which offer discounts of from 50¢ to \$1 off the game fees and a usual reduction on subscription costs. Some of the included zines are Don Miller's DIPLOPHOBIA and DIPLOMANIA, Rod Walker's EHREWON, Chris Schleicher's ATLANTIS and Len Lakofka's brontosaurus and LIAISONS DANGEREUSES.

The IFW provides numerous committee services including Rating, Matching, Rule Interpretations, Design Bureau and the Publication Department. All services are free or at very reduced costs. The Wargaming organization is designed to produce tournaments within IFW (Feudal Empire) and with other wargaming clubs.

Finally all of this is guaranteed by the IFW Constitution which provides for elected officers and a Senate to administer the runnings of this giant organization. It is a democratic organization not under the control of one person or a group of people. It sponsors and encourages many meetings and conventions on the local level through Chapters and ftf meetings.

Therefore, regardless of you field of wargaming interest--administration, writing, tournaments of many kinds, conventions, PBM or FTF competition (with all of the accessory services) or just the enjoyment of a professional wargaming magazine, the IFW has something for you.

Dues: \$6 / year

Subscription to the IW: \$5 / year

Make checks payable to the INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF WARGAMING

President: Lenard Lakofka, 1806 N. Richmond St., Chicago, Ill. 60647  
312-342-6857

Editor: John Bobek, 3919 W. 68th., Chicago, Ill. 60629